Case 3:14-cr-00163-WHO Document 5 Filed 05/30/14 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	14-16	13	WHO
	Plaintiff, v.)	STIPULATEI UNDER THE	O ORDER E SPEEDY T	EXCLU TRIAL	JDING TIME ACT
Vincen	T HMRIS, Defendant.)))			NOO	MAY 30 2014
		j			-11/7	RICHARD W. WIEKING HERN DISTRICT COURT des time under the
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on						
	Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).					
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).					
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
IT IS SO ORDERED.						
DATEI	D: <u>5-30-1</u> 9		JACQUELINI United State		ORLE	
STIPUI	LATED: Under Mun Attorney for Defendant E. FALK		Assistant Unit B. 704k		ttorney	-